REMARKS

Within the Office Action, claims 1 and 19-63 were pending. Claims 50-55 were rejected. Claims 1, 19-49, and 56-63 were allowed. Previously, claims 2-18 and 64-68 were canceled. Thus, claims 1 and 19-63 are now pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, claims 50-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,404,365 to Hiiro (Hiiro) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,313,479 to Florence (Florence) and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/00194554 A1 to Tadic-Galeb et al. (Tadic-Galeb). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 50 recites, in part (underlining added):

> means for combining a first polarized laser output and a second polarized laser output, the first polarized laser output being incoherent with the second polarized laser output, the first polarized laser output and the second polarized laser output having orthogonal polarizations, whereby a third laser output is formed.

Hiiro is directed to a system that combines multiple laser beams to produce an amplified laser beam. [Hiiro, *e.g.*, col. 3, lines 59-64] In Figure 1, cited within the Office Action, Hiiro discloses a unit U1 of the system 1. The unit U1 comprises a polarizing beam splitter P1 that combines a P-polarized light beam with an S-polarized light beam. Hiiro does not teach that the P-polarized light beam and the S-polarized light beam are incoherent. Indeed, in that portion of Hiiro cited within the Office Action, Hiiro does not even discuss using incoherent light beams, as recited in claim 50 of the present invention.

Florence is directed to a system for moving light interference patterns so that they are undetectable to the human eye. [Abstract] Florence teaches passing multiple laser beams through a diffuser to reduce or eliminate the appearance of speckle. Florence does not teach that the combined laser beams are incoherent to one another, as recited in claim 50.

Tadic-Galeb teaches a projection lens system having an illumination subsystem. [Tadic-Galeb, ¶ 0013] That portion of Tadic-Galeb cited within the Office Action teaches using a diffusive screen to intercept multiple light beams at multiple locations. [*See* Tadic-Galeb, Figure 20 and ¶¶ 0077-0078] Nowhere in that portion of Tadic-Galeb cited within the Office Action does Tadic-Galeb teach combining the light beams, let alone combining incoherent light beams, as recited in claim 50.

Claim 50 recites structure neither taught nor suggested in the cited prior art. Indeed, within the Office Action, it is not even suggested that the prior art recites the structure of claim

50 recited above. For at least this reason, claim 50 is allowable over the cited prior art.
Furthermore, because claims 51-55 depend from claim 50, they too are allowable as depending
from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 50-55 are
now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. If the
Examiner has any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-
9700 to discuss them so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 8-21-03

By: Thomas B. Haverstock
Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Creation date: 12-23-2003
Indexing Officer: BENGEDA - BERHANU ENGEDA
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 09498703

Legal Date: 11-25-2003

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	CTNF	11
2	892	1
3	1449	43

Total number of pages: 55

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on ....